Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Cornelis Kreemer Tectonic Motion Research Equipment

DOI-BLM-AZ-P040-2011-001-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Sonoran Desert National Monument (SDNM)

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-35469

Proposed Action Title/Type: Land Use Authorization - Permit Location of Proposed Action: T. 6 S., R. 3 W., Section 5, SWNE.

Description of Proposed Action: Cornelis W. Kreemer, in conjunction with the University of Arizona, is proposing to install a small GPS monument that will be part of a new 33 station network across the United States - Southwest to measure very precisely the horizontal motion of the earth's crust. The measurements will help to determine the levels of active tectonic deformation, the associated seismic hazard, and the implication of the past and future geologic evolution of the area. The proposed GPS monument is an approximately 12-inch long and 1-inch wide stainless steel pin. Half of the monument will be placed, with epoxy, in a hole that will be drilled within the bedrock. The GPS antenna will be about a foot wide and will be placed on the pin. The data will be collected in a box that will be covered with a small solar panel. There will also be one or two car batteries, which will be sealed and placed in protective cases. The GPS monument will not be permanent and will be removed at the end of the permit's term.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan/EIS Date Approved/Amended: 6/0/1988
☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):
☑ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The Lower Gila Resource Area processes a variety of land actions in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area – rights-of-way, communication sites, easements, permits, and unauthorized occupancy. All lands cases would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

C: Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5:

E.(19). Issuance of short-term (3 years or less) rights-of-way or land use authorizations for such uses as storage sites, apiary sites, and construction sites where the proposal includes rehabilitation to restore the land to its natural or original condition.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: Not Applicable

D: Signature		
Authorizing Official:/s/	Richard B. Hanson	Date:
	RICHARD B. HANSON SDNM Manager	

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact: Jo Ann Goodlow, Realty Specialist, Phoenix District Office – Lower Sonoran Field Office, 21605 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85027, 623-580-5500.

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances Attachment 1

The acti	on has be	en reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43		
CFR 46	.215) app	ly. The project would:		
1. l	Have significant impacts on public health or safety			
Yes	No	Rationale: The placement of the GPS monument should not have any		
		impacts on public health or safety. The device, which is relatively		
		small in size, will be secured into bedrock and should not have any		
		impacts on public health or safety.		
		ificant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic		
		stics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands;		
		s or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural		
		s; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands		
		e Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national		
		ts; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically		
		t or critical areas?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action will not have any significant impacts		
		to such natural resources as those listed above.		
		ly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts		
		g alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes	No	Rationale: Placement of the GPS monument will not have any highly		
	<u> </u>	controversial effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning		
		alternative uses of available resources.		
	_	ly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve		
		unknown environmental risks?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The GPS monument will not have any highly uncertain		
		and potentially significant environment effects or involve unique or		
		unknown environmental risks.		
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about				
future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?				
Yes	No	Rationale: The placement of the GPS monument would not establish		
		a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle		
		about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects.		
		rect relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but		
		ely significant, environmental effects?		
Yes	No	Rationale: The placement of the GPS monument is within the Sonoran		
		Desert National Monument. It would not have a direct relationship to		

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

		other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively	
		significant, environmental effects. The action is a temporary	
		placement and will have no long term or significant impacts.	
7. H	Iave sign	ificant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the	
N	Vational F	Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?	
Yes	No	Rationale: There would be no anticipated impacts to any significant	
		cultural resources. Should any cultural resources be found, the	
	\square	standard stipulation will come into effect.	
8. H	Iave sign	ificant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of	
E	Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated		
C	Critical H	abitat for these species?	
Yes	No	Rationale: There would not be any significant impacts on species	
		listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or	
		Threatened Species, nor would there be significant impacts on	
		designated Critical Habitat for these species.	
9. V	iolate a	Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for	
tl	ne protec	tion of the environment?	
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action does not violate any Federal law, or	
		State, local or tribal law or any requirements imposed for the	
		protection of the environment.	
10. H	Iave a dis	sproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority	
p	opulation	ns (Executive Order 12898)?	
Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed GPS monument does not have a	
		disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority	
		populations.	
11. L	imit acce	ess to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by	
Indian religious practitioners, or significantly adversely affect the physical			
integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007)?			
Yes	No	Rationale: Placement of the GPS monument would not require for	
		consultation with tribes regarding Indian sacred sites to take place.	
12. C	Contribute	e to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or	
	non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that may		
promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species			
(Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?			
Yes	No	Rationale: The placement of the GPS monument will not contribute to	
		the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or	
		non-native invasive species known to occur in the area, or actions that	
_		may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of	
		such species.	
	1		

Approval and Decision Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Jo Ann Goodlow Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Jo Ann Goodlow

criteria and that it wou	rmined that the proposal is in accordance with tall not involve any significant environmental efform further environmental review.	_	
Prepared by:		Date:	1 / 1 0 / 2 0 1 1
	Jo Ann Goodlow Project Lead		
Reviewed by:	/s/ Leah Baker_	Date:	1 / 1 2 / 2 0 1 1
	Leah Baker Planning & Environmental Coordinator		
Reviewed by:	/s/ Richard B. Hanson	Date:	1 / 1 4 / 2 0 1 1
·	Richard B. Hanson Manager		

Project Description:

Cornelis W. Kreemer, in conjunction with the University of Arizona, is proposing to install a small GPS monument that will be part of a new 33 station network across the United States - Southwest to measure very precisely the horizontal motion of the earth's crust. The measurements will help to determine the levels of active tectonic deformation, the associated seismic hazard, and the implication of the past and future geologic evolution of the area. The proposed GPS monument is an approximately 12-inch long and 1-inch wide stainless steel pin. Half of the monument will be placed, with epoxy, in a hole that will be drilled within the bedrock. The GPS antenna will be about a foot wide and will be placed on the pin. The data will be collected in a box that will be covered with a small solar panel. There will also be one or two car batteries, which will be sealed and placed in protective cases. The GPS monument will not be permanent and will be removed at the end of the permit's term.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).			
Approved By : 1/14/11	/s/ Richard B. Hanson	Date:	
	Richard B. Hanson		